

CUSTOMER NO.  
34456

## REMARKS

In reply to the Final Office Action mailed on October 28, 2005 in which claims 1-11 and 13-18 were pending, reconsideration of the rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### Claims 19-38 are Allowable

The Office has rejected Claims 1-8, 10-11, 13 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,956,493 to Hewitt, et al. ("Hewitt"), at paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Final Office Action. Additionally, the Office has rejected Claims 4, 9, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt over what was allegedly known in the art at the time of Applicants' invention, at paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Final Office Action. Further, the Office has rejected Claims 1-11 and 13-18 as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,092,137 to Huang, et al. ("Huang"), in view of Hewitt and in view of what was allegedly known in the art at the time of Applicants' invention, at paragraph 8 of the Final Office Action.

Applicants have cancelled claims 1-11 and 13-18 in the application and have added new claims 19-38. No new subject matter has been added. In contrast to Hewitt and Huang, independent claims 19 and 29 disclose a first access priority value that corresponds to a processing function that is provided by a first functional device, and a second access priority value that corresponds to a different processing function that is provided by a second functional device. As the Office has stated in the Final Office Action, "Hewitt teaches an arbitration method and system including programmable request latency counters that vary the priority of a requesting device according to the amount of time spent waiting to be granted access to a system resource...." (Final Office Action, p.9). Huang teaches "a scheme for arbitrating access to a data bus," in which "each competing source is assigned an adjustable priority weighting value ... based on the bandwidth requirements of the competing source." (Huang, abstract, col. 2, ll. 27-31). The assignment of priorities based on processing function, as claimed, is distinguishable from Hewitt and Huang. None of the cited references discloses or suggests assigning priority values based on the processing function of each functional device.

CUSTOMER NO.  
34456


## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the application and issue a Notice of Allowance for all claims now pending. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney or agent.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

12-23-2005  
Date

  
Jeffrey G. Toler; Reg. No. 38,342  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.  
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(512) 327-5515 (phone)  
(512) 327-5452 (fax)